



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mistakes of fact, except in so far as some of the above may be so interpreted, are happily few in the book. It may be asked what is meant by "Für ihn [Otfrid] war in erster Linie der Gedanke an seine Gemeinde massgebend" (p. 7). "Was der Deutsche zu thun pflegt, wird ihm zur Pflicht" (p. 51), is precisely hind side before, since *Pflicht* is the abstract noun to *pflegen* long before the verb is used with the meaning 'to be accustomed to.' It is by no means certain that "Mond von Haus aus den (Zeit-)Messer bezeichnet" (p. 88). *Dänemark* is apparently not 'Dänenwald' (p. 89), but simply 'Dänengrenze' (cf. Vigfússon and Kluge); nor is *Seeland* (p. 89) to be derived from an. *lundr* (not *lund* as cited by Professor Weise) but rather to be divided *Seel-* and and referred to the root *sal*. cf. Vigfússon). "Dass es Freude bereitete, das Vieh zur Weide zur führen, sagt das Wort *Wonne*='Weide'" (p. 90). *Wonne*, however, mhd. *wunne* (*wünne*), ahd. *wunna* (*wunni*) got. **wunja*, has in fact quite a different history from the first member of the compound *Wonnemonat* to which Professor Weise refers, for this is related through mhd. *wünne*, ahd. *wunnea* to got. *winja* 'pasturage,' 'fodder' (cf. Kluge). I question also whether in Luther's *wollen doch solcher Predigt nicht, ich kenne des Menschen nicht* we have the government of the genitive by the verb. It seems more likely that the genitive is partitive in the Middle High German fashion after *nicht*. I cannot find that in M.H.G. *wollen* or *kennen* govern the genitive. Franke (*Schriftsprache* Luthers, p. 239) finds that *wollen* governs in Luther the accusative; the only example of the genitive cited being the one given above; while *nicht* occurs for *nichts* (*ib.* p. 270).¹

A few minor errors remain to be corrected. English *clap* (p. 93, note 3) is Shaksperian, but not modern for 'embrace;' *dear* (p. 226, l. 27) should read *deer*; and *wafre* (p. 232, note),

¹ Grimm, *Wb.* s. v. *kennen* cites: "ich kenn dein nit, wann du hast mein nit bekant, dieweil du lebest"—Heiligenleben, 1472, 127a. Cf. *Gram.* iv, 652: "durch jenes die einfache negation begleitende *niowiht niht* werden fast alle ahd. und mhd. verneinenden sätze in bezug auf die partitive construction zweifelhaft." Kehrein, *Gram.*, gives no example of a genitive after *wollen*; and none without a negation after *kennen* (iii, 123).

wafer. I do not know what is meant by English *bill* (p. 102, l. 30) associated with German *Unbill* and *billig*, unless possibly an imaginary noun from A.S. *bilewit*. *Mhd* (p. 153, l. 10) is evidently a misprint for *nhd*.

It will be seen that the errors pointed out are not of great moment in themselves, and detract but little from the value of the work from the author's point of view. Adverse criticism is indeed based largely upon a difference of opinion as to method and manner. For a book of its kind *Unsere Muttersprache* is carefully and well written, and the scientific basis of it may be pronounced sufficient. Much useful material is here; the aptly introduced bibliography is especially full; and the treatment is stimulating. The book will not fill the want, still felt by so many learners of German, of a systematic and somewhat detailed history of the language, correlating the grammars of different periods, and explaining the peculiarities of modern German. But in its own sphere it may, after a proper caution, be commended to American students.

WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD.

Harvard University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ELIZABETHAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS INSANITY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The interesting thesis of Mr. Corbin's recent work on "The Elizabethan *Hamlet*," in regard to the conventionally comic aspects of insanity to the contemporaries of Shakspeare, might be enforced by many citations from the literature of the time other than those noticed by Mr. Corbin. In Percy's *Reliques* (ed. Wheatley, London, 1886, vol. ii, pp. 344 f.) there is a sheaf of old songs and ballads of madness. The intent of several of these is obviously comic. The mad-songs from Tom D'Urfey of a somewhat later date (1694), with their bathetical attempts at the sentimentally romantic, suggest that the serious acceptance of the pathos of insanity began early—of course it was existent with the Elizabethans alongside of the comic interpre-

tation, as Mr. Corbin points out—and that it rapidly grew to be the conventional point of view. There is a good deal of this sort of thing throughout the literature of the Eighteenth Century, where it plays a part worth noticing in the Romantic Reaction. Mr. Corbin has pointed out several of the mad-scenes in Elizabethan literature which are important material in the study of this topic. My observations include the following: Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (see especially in ed. Dyce, London, 1861, pp. 99 n., 100, 104-106—the effect striven for is very mixed, but the fantastically comic is obviously one of the elements); Marlowe's *First Part of Tamburlaine*, act v, scene ii (ed. Bullen, i, 97—where the effect to us moderns at least is bloody and sombre; indeed, Was Marlowe likely to design it otherwise?); Lyly (?), *The Woman in the Moon*, act v (ed. Fairholt, vol. ii, pp. 199 f.—this is a "piteous lunacy," but the intention is satiric); Webster, *The White Devil* (in the part of Cornelia, with its obvious reminiscences of Shakspeare), and the sufficiently noted dance of madmen in *The Duchess of Malfi* (commented upon by Mr. Corbin); Middleton's *Changeling* (similarly noted); Ford's *The Broken Heart*, iv, sc. ii (intention pathetic); Jonson, *The Alchemist*, act iv, sc. iii (a bit of feigned lunacy), and in *Bartholomew Fair*, the part of Trouble-all (a comic madman); Dekker's *First Part of the Honest Whore*, act v, sc. ii (note that the visitors to the madhouse first laugh at the "first madman's" ravings, but are rebuked for it—"Do you laugh at God's creatures?"—; then they comment, "A very piteous sight"); Shirley's *The Cardinal*, act v, sc. iii (feigned madness?—the treatment is serious); Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (Hazlitt's Dodsley, v, 56 f., 94 f., 106 f., 130 f.; cf. p. 164). Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, act v (Sir Giles Overreach); Fletcher's *The Pilgrim*, act iii, sc. vii, act iv, sc. iii, act v, sc. v (here we have the interior of a madhouse, which the Pilgrim is taken to see as one of the sights of the city. He is promised the view of fancies and gestures—

"Some of pity,
That it would make you melt to see their passions;
And some as light again, that would content you."

Fletcher's *The Noble Gentleman*, I, sc.iii, iii,

sc. ii, iv, sc. iii, v, sc. i (in the part of Chatilion, "a gentleman mad for love"); Fletcher's *The Nice Valor*, or *The Passionate Madman*, passim; and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, iii, sc. iv, v, sc. i, iii, v, sc. ii (the Jailor's daughter running mad for love of Palamon is welcomed by the morris-dancers as one who will make their fortunes. She joins their dance before the Duke. The pathos of her state is accentuated, though somewhat bizarrely). See also Campion's *The Lords' Masque* (ed. Bullen, pp. 192 f.—*Mania, the goddess of Madness*, the dance of the *Twelve Frantics*, etc.). Outside of the drama an interesting burlesque treatment of insanity is to be found in Anthony Scoloker's (?) *Daiphantus, or The Passions of Love, Comical to read, But Tragical to Act*, London, 1604 (reprinted in Arber's *English Garner*, vol. vii pp. 379 f.). In the mock-dedication the author pretends that such a poem as his ought to be

"like friendly *Shake-speare's* Tragedies, where the Comedian rides, when the Tragedian stands on tiptoe. Faith, it should please all, like Prince *Hamlet!* But, in sadness, then it were to be feared, he would run mad. In sooth, I will not be moonsick, to please! nor out of my wits, though I displease all!"

See also pp. 408-9, where Daiphantus runs mad for love.

"TASSO he finds, by that of HAMLET thinks,
Terms him a madman, then of his ink horn drinks!"
.... "Puts off his clothes! his shirt he only wears!
Much like mad HAMLET, thus, as Passion tears!"

The satirical intent here is obvious. But did the audience of Shakspeare's *Hamlet* find cause for merriment in the supposed madness of the part? Did Hamlet, in order to give the groundlings a fit of mirth and thus "please all," "run mad"?

FREDERIC IVES CARPENTER.
The University of Chicago.

GROOVY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Professor Brander Matthews calls attention in your issue of December, 1895, to the words *groovy* and *grooviness*, which he ranks as Briticisms; but I am sure that many of us have suffered the dint of these words afar from British soil. A particularly delicious